

[11th July 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 1952-53—*cont.*

4-15
p.m.

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I begin with the Services. It was said in the other House by Mr. P. T. Rajan, the Leader of the Justice Party, that for a good and efficient administration it is necessary to have an able, efficient and contented Service. With that general proposition, I find myself in complete agreement. There ought to be a contented Service for every good administration. The Leader of the Justice Party went on to say that there was a contented Service under this Government, and the Hon. the Finance Minister cited that statement with obvious satisfaction. So, let us see whether there is a contented Service now under the present Government? I am not talking about the few highly placed officials who are getting thousands of rupees as salaries and who come in daily contact with the Ministers of the Government. Probably they are contented. Let us look at the 80 or 85 per cent of those Government servants who do not come under the category of ‘Gazetted Officers’. What are the salaries and emoluments paid to them? It is generally believed that the minimum salary paid by the Government is something like Rs. 45 per month and that the majority of non-gazetted officers are supposed to begin their career with a salary of Rs. 45 per month. Sir, it is only when we look into the actual figures of salaries furnished in the budget, we find that the vast majority of the Services, which are supposed to be contented, are given as salary either Rs. 30 or below. Do the Services say that they are contented? The Police Constable is paid a salary of Rs. 30 per month. The Elementary School Teacher gets Rs. 30 as his basic salary. The Jail Warders get Rs. 30 as salary. Sir, this salary of Rs. 30 itself is bad enough. One will be surprised to know, that the vast majority of the members of the Inferior and Subordinate Services get much less than Rs. 30 per month. The Blue Printer in the Madras Town-Planning Department gets Rs. 25 per month. The Field Assistants belonging to the Madras Public Health Service get Rs. 25. The Nursing Orderlies in the Madras Medical Subordinate Service get Rs. 24 a month as salary. The Attenders belonging to the Madras General Subordinate Service get Rs. 24 a month. How can a person live on Rs. 24 a month and keep his body and soul together? Obviously it is not the intention of the Government that the body and soul should be kept together. There are also members belonging to the Services who are getting Rs. 20 as salary per month. The Firemen Labourers belonging to the Madras Fire Subordinate Service get Rs. 20 as salary per month. The Blue Print Operators (II Grade) in the Madras Engineering Subordinate Service get Rs. 20 a month as salary. The Senior Flockmen in the Madras Veterinary Subordinate Service get Rs. 20 as salary.

“ The Hon. the Finance Minister is not here. I would have liked to put him a straight question : ‘ Does he know the lowest

11th July 1952] [Sri S. B. Adityan]

salary which a Government servant gets? I am asking the Hon. Chief Minister whether he is aware of the lowest salary which a Government servant, under the so-called contented service, is getting? He can answer, if he is aware of it. I will read out a few more figures.

"The Attendants in the Forest Subordinate Service get Rs. 18 a month. The Peons and Lascars belonging to the Madras Inferior Service get Rs. 18 a month. The Cleaner in the Madras Operation Subordinate Service gets Rs. 18 per month. The Ayahs, and the Nursing Orderlies of the Madras Medical Subordinate Service get Rs. 18 and Rs. 17 respectively. The Junior Flockmen belonging to the Madras Veterinary Subordinate Service get Rs. 15. A good number of Watchmen in the Madras Government Inferior Services get a princely sum of Rs. 15 a month.

"Sir, if a person is paid a salary as low as Rs. 15 a month, how is he to carry on his life with his family consisting of his wife and children? He has to purchase food and clothing for himself and for his family, all within Rs. 15 a month. I ask the Hon. Chief Minister, what else can these people do but to beg? We see a number of people—peons and watchmen—asking for 'baksheesh' from visitors to the Government Offices. It is said, this is 'corruption or illegal gratification'. I admit, but I ask: 'Are not the Government compelling these people to resort to the so-called bribery?' I think, it is better to describe this practice as 'beggary' instead of 'corruption'. Sir, the Government have fixed minimum wages to people employed by private employers. I ask the Hon. Chief Minister, as the Hon. Finance Minister is not here, 'You are asking the private employers to pay living wages to their employees. Does this not apply to the Government?' Is it not the duty of the Government to pay living wages to members of the so-called contented Service? The Hon. the Finance Minister has got peculiar notions about a 'living wage'. In his Budget speech he says that he has brought forward a 'magnificent' scheme for alleviating the distress of the handloom weavers and they are going to be given a subsistence wage of Rs. 15 a month. I ask the Government; 'Is that a living wage or is that their idea of a living wage?' Sri P. T. Rajan, the Leader of the Justice Party, has certified that the Services are contented. I ask, what does he know of the Services? The peons who stand at the doors of the Offices or at the doors of the houses of Ministers will be able to tell whether they are contented or not. The vast majority of Government servants are not getting a living wage. I ask the hon. Member (Dr. C. Nathamuni Naidu) to try to live within Rs. 24 per month and see whether it is sufficient. I want merely to explain, Sir, the difficulties experienced by the members of the so-called Inferior and Subordinate Services. Recently it was published in the newspapers that Mr. Kalyanasundaram Ayyar of North Arcot district from where the hon. Member, Dr. C. Nathamuni Naidu, hails, represented to the District Collector about the case of a Government servant starving every night. The cases of the Non-Gazetted Officers who are drawing a salary of Rs. 45 a month have

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

been repeatedly put forward to the Hon. Chief Minister. There was a report in the newspapers—it may be right or wrong—that some of the Non-Gazetted officers drawing a salary of Rs. 45 per month made a representation for an increase in their salaries to the Hon. Chief Minister when he attended some anniversary. The Hon. Chief Minister very rightly pointed out to them that a small increase in their pay would not be of much value to them and, if a small increase in their salaries was sanctioned, they might spend that by going to the cinemas which was bad for the eyes and which was also bad from the moral point of view or they might spend that extra money on smoking, which was bad for the lungs. I agree with the Hon. Chief Minister that it is bad for the eyes to go to the cinema, and it is also bad for the lungs to smoke. I myself do not smoke cigarettes. I ask the Hon. Chief Minister whether he should not apply the same principle in the case of the highly placed officials who are getting much more by way of salary than these non-gazetted officials who are getting Rs. 45 or Rs. 50 per month. The Hon. the Chief Minister gave also a sermon on that occasion from the Bhagavad Gita that one should do one's duty without caring for rewards and it was doing the 'duty' that mattered and not the money rewards. That is indeed a statement of very high principles. I ask the Government whether these principles do not apply to the big officers who are drawing a salary of Rs. 3,000 and above, to the Hon. Ministers of the Government, to the Chief Whip of the Government who is given Rs. 700 or even the Governor. Many of these non-gazetted officers will rather submit themselves to the supposed injury that might be caused to them by getting a little more money than altogether being deprived of it.

4-30
P.m.

"I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister and also the Hon. the Minister for Finance with all humility to give that advice to the highest paid officials in the State, to the Ministers and to His Excellency the Governor. On the previous occasion when we discussed the question of the moneys expended on the Governor, I did not have the figures with me and I was contradicted. I said categorically that the sum expended on the Governor was Rs. 10 lakhs and the Hon. the Minister for Finance immediately jumped up and contradicted me: 'How dare you say that it is Rs. 10 lakhs? You are always giving wrong figures.' I humbly asked him if it was not ten lakhs, what was the real figure, and he replied that it was Rs. 7 lakhs. I submit that it does not reduce the force of my arguments. I have now got the correct figures. The Hon. the Chief Minister was good enough to draw the attention of the legislators to the very high and noble example of Dr. Jeyasoorya who made a wrong statement in Parliament but when the mistake was pointed out to him, he was ready and willing to come forward with an apology for the wrong statement he had made. That was commended by the Hon. the Chief Minister. The Hon. the Chief Minister says that he did not commend Mr. Jeyasoorya's action but was commenting upon it. I suppose he does not commend a man making an apology when he makes a mistake and the mistake

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

is pointed out to him! For my figures, I rely upon the Budget Memorandum, page 71. I shall now read the various figures because on the last occasion when I committed a mistake the Members on the Treasury Benches had a laugh over it. This is what is stated in the Budget—

	LAKHS.
Salary of the Governor	66

which is Rs. 10,000 more than what the Raja Government provided because the Government is now headed by Rajaji, with two additional letters to the name—

	LAKHS.
Sumptuary allowance	23

This is not subject to audit and then we have—

	LAKHS.
Secretarial staff to the Governor	46
Staff and household of the Governor	2.48
Expenditure from contract allowance	1.50

This is not subject to audit and any amount of expenditure can be made and no question can be asked about the expenditure.

	LAKHS.
Tour expenses	1.71
Discretionary grants by His Excellency the Governor	25

If these figures are added up, it comes to Rs. 7,29,000. But then there are the other charges on this account as stated on page 72 of the Budget :—

	RS.
Improvements to official residence	50,000
Maintenance of gardens	64,000
Electricity	55,000
Water	17,000
Taxes	46,000
Repairs	1,03,000

which if added, gives a figure of Rs. 3,35,000. Then there is power for him to re-appropriate from one head to another."

DR. C. NATHAMUNI NAIDU :—" This represents capital expenditure."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" My hon. Friend says that this is capital expenditure for the Governor. I wish only to ask him how expenditure on water, electricity, repairs, taxes and maintenance on gardens could be brought under capital expenditure. Any way, Sir, whether it is capital or other expenditure, the total amount expended for the Governor is Rs. 10 lakhs per year. But the Hon.

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

the Finance Minister contradicted me on the last occasion. I do not know if my arithmetic is wrong; if so, I would ask any one of his experts to add these figures and find out whether it comes to the round figure of Rs. 10 lakhs. I know it is a delicate thing to ask His Excellency to reduce the expenditure a little in view of the distress and misery prevailing in the State on account of the low purchasing power of the people. It is a delicate thing for the Hon. the Chief Minister to do. I am not asking him to do it because the moment the Hon. the Chief Minister goes to the Governor and asks him to cut down the expenditure what will Shri Sri Prakasa, the Governor, say? Will he not ask him: 'Is this not ingratitude on your part; I have done so much for the Congress party and have put the Government of the State in the hands . . . ' "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I do not think that the hon. Member is justified in making the remarks; this is not the way."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" Is it your ruling, Sir, that I must not refer to the Governor because I must bow to your ruling now. But in doing so, let me know the terms of the ruling. Must I not refer to the Governor at all? "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I do not object to it at all; but the hon. Member must do that in dignified and courteous terms."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I will refer to His Excellency in the most courteous terms."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The hon. Member was asking for a ruling, Sir. It is not for me to give a ruling on the point but I wish to raise a point of order. I wish to submit Sir, that the imaginary conversation that he was proceeding to detail is totally out of order."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" If the Hon. Chief Minister is not to approach His Excellency the Governor, I submit it is open to the Hon. the Finance Minister to do it and it can be done in the most humble manner and in the most delicate manner."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I wish to know whether His Excellency has anything to do with the framing of the Budget for the Governor's estimates or whether it is others that are responsible for it."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I take it, Sir, that it is the Hon. the Minister for Finance that is responsible for it and therefore, I am putting it to him. He is not here; he ought to be here to hear the criticisms of the Opposition on the Budget. I have got to imagine he is here and I suppose whatever suggestions are made here will certainly be carried to him. After all, Sir, delicate things have been solved by the Hon. the Minister for Finance; he is a capable person and he has got much persuasive powers. It is well known that when the . . . "

11th July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am surprised at the extreme want of understanding of the hon. Member. Any observations made by him are made to the Government as such and it is not necessary for the Finance Minister to be here at all times. Therefore, he need not stress his absence so much. He is ill at home and I am here and the whole Government is here and the Leader of the Opposition may make any observations; they will be noted and will receive attention. There is no point, I submit, in carrying on a debate without this elementary understanding.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ The elementary understanding is that Rs. 10 lakhs of public money is spent on the Governor; that is the elementary and basic thing, which the poor people of the State cannot bear. About the Hon. the Finance Minister, I did not know that he was ill and I am so sorry. If I had known that he was ill, I would not have made that observation. But whatever observation I was making was not against his ability. I was merely saying that he was a very capable person; I was not saying that he was incapable. Without going into the details whether the Hon. the Chief Minister or the Finance Minister should approach, I leave that topic and I merely expect some miracle whereby this considerable expenditure out of public funds could be saved.

“ About miracles, it has been said by the hon. Members sitting on that side that one of the miracles performed by this Government since they took up office, was that they produced rain. It was said here that there was a downpour of rain after the present Government took up the reins of office. It may be a miracle or not; it may be due to anything; it may be due to the Hon. the Chief Minister being one of the Members of the Government or it may not be due to it. But these are all matters which are not fit for discussion in this House and it had much better be discussed at public meetings where no restrictions regarding parliamentary expressions and the like holds good. But a miracle supposed to have been performed by the Government and the Hon. the Chief Minister which is a matter of importance and which must be mentioned here is derationing. The announcement regarding derationing was made over the radio on the 6th night. I freely admit that there has been a sense of relief all round. People in all walks of life felt that unnecessary restrictions have been removed and as a whole they felt much relieved that they were now free at last from the tyranny of officials, from the vexatious regulations of the Government and the Government also felt that they were relieved from the attendant accusation of being the (six-ounce Government); big landlords felt free because they need not sell their grains at controlled prices; blackmarketers felt free because they might sell rice at any profit because there was no restriction and there was a general sense of freedom. People felt as much relieved as one would feel if a tight shoe that had been chafing the skin for a long time had been suddenly removed. The sense of relief was there. But we have got to look at the real facts as they are. Rationing, I must tell you, Sir, was not

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

the malady. What was the disease? The disease was scarcity and rationing and controls were the medicines. The medicine has been stopped and should we not have an indication that the disease has ceased to exist? Is there more production? In fact, the Hon. the Chief Minister at Anantapur went to the extent of saying that he will not continue in office if decontrol fails. I have got the actual quotation in case there is a denial. He said that if decontrol succeeds, he would remain in office, if it does not, he will not continue in the Government. What, may I ask, is the meaning of the success of decontrol? In season and out of season, it has been said that plenty of rice is available in the market.

4-45
p.m.

“ Sir, the Hon. the Finance Minister has said in one of his speeches that rice is now available in plenty. May I ask, at what price? Rice has always been available in plenty. In Bengal when hundreds of thousands of persons died for want of rice, even then rice was available in plenty. There is no dearth of rice but it is available at a price beyond the reach of the people. If the Government supply rice to the people at the original control price, then this policy of decontrol will succeed. Sir, when I listened to the broadcast of the Hon. Chief Minister over the radio on the 6th June, I was listening carefully to see whether there was any reference to the prices. He said, ‘Decontrol must succeed. Now farmers are free to take rice anywhere to sell at any price they like.’ On the next morning, that is on the 7th June, the Hon. Chief Minister said, ‘The free market rice would become cheaper than the rice supplied in the fair price shops and ultimately we might find it difficult to sell our rice in fair price shops as we cannot reduce the prices’. So on the 7th June, the Hon. the Chief Minister had an idea of what was meant by ‘success of decontrol’, namely, that rice would be made available to the people at the control price. I am soon coming to the point, what is meant by control price? I would point out that, by repeated assertions, the Government have held out promises to the people of this State that rice will be available to them freely in any quantity at the former control price. Now, the Hon. Minister for Food on the 12th June said: ‘The retail price of rice available in the open market would stabilise round about the control price at which rice is sold in the fair price shops.’ Then, Pandit Nehru on the 13th June said that the prices of foodgrains in the Madras State both in the free market and in the blackmarket were below the control price. Obviously Pandit Nehru made that statement from the facts supplied by this Government. Then again, on the 21st June, the Hon. Minister for Food, in his radio speech, said: ‘An all-round fall in the price of rice in the open market has been reported from all centres. Rice is said to be available in the open market in some centres at a price on a level with the control price.’ Rice is available in some markets at the control price! Then he says, ‘The Government are confident that the prices will settle down soon and stabilise round about the level of the control price.’ Now I have read out the statements made first by the Hon. Chief Minister, then the Hon. Minister for Food, then by the Prime Minister of India and

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

then by the Hon. Minister for Food again, to the effect that the prices would not only come down to the level of control price but would remain there stabilised.

“ Now, what are the control prices? In Madras, the control price of first sort raw rice is Re. 0-13-6 per measure and boiled rice Re. 0-13-3. The second sort raw rice is Re. 0-10-6 per measure and boiled rice Re. 0-10-0. Now, Sir, we are not concerned with the first sort rice. Let the first sort rice be consumed by the zamindars, millowners and landed proprietors. Let them eat the first sort. We do not care about them. What we want is that the second sort rice which is sold at 10 annas per Madras measure must be made available in larger quantities to the people. Has that been done? Sir, when it appeared in the newspapers some time ago that rice was available in Pattukkottai, Tanjore district, at 8 annas per Madras measure, I immediately sent a man to Pattukkottai to find out whether it was a fact. The price there was 14 annas per measure. Then a hunt was made for the correspondent who sent the news but the correspondent went underground. On another occasion, in another paper, a statement was made that rice was available at 9 annas per measure but it did not reveal where it was available. Therefore, the fact remains that till now the price in the free market is very much higher than the control price which is 10 annas per Madras measure. We are asking for nothing more and nothing less than what the Hon. Chief Minister has promised us. He must keep up the promise he made at a public meeting in Anantapur when he even staked his very office on this question of success of decontrol. He did not define what he meant by ‘ success of decontrol ’. The Hon. Minister for Finance has stated in unambiguous terms that the price of rice would be brought down to 10 annas per Madras measure and that it would stabilise there. Sir, if anyone says that it has already come down to that level, there is absolutely no truth in it. If it is true that the prices in the free market have already come down to the control price, I ask, why are the Congress M.L.As from Tanjore district asking for fair price shops. They tried to abolish fair price shops in Nagapattinam, Mayuram and Tanjore. With what result? In Tanjore the people who were earning 10 annas a day went to the shop to get a Madras measure of rice but they were asked to pay more. They did not have money and so they agitated that fair price shops should be opened in all the municipal towns in Tanjore district. The Government in three days reversed their original order dispensing with the fair price shops. Recently they tried it in Madras. Recently the price of rice sold in the railway grain-shops was increased and the railway workers struck work. People are now demanding that the promise held out to them by the Government that rice will be available in plenty at the control price should be carried out. I merely ask the Hon. Chief Minister to keep his promise? Try and bring down the price of rice with all the ability which you have, to the level of the control price. People expect you to do that. If the prices do not come down to that level it would mean that the people's interests have been sacrificed for the doctrine of ‘ free economy ’ and there would be

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

nothing in the accusations made by people like Pandit Kunzru that it was political opportunism which was at the bottom of decontrol. Sir, people have no purchasing capacity. Now, you cannot ask a person to pay more than 10 annas per measure when he is accustomed to pay only 10 annas. Even if you ask him to pay more, he cannot pay it.

“ Sir, members on the Government Benches talked about high principles and said that decontrol was the result of the principles enunciated by Mahatmaji. It was said repeatedly that Gandhiji wanted decontrol. Sir, I admit that Gandhiji did want decontrol. But why do you drag in Gandhiji's name only for the purpose of decontrol? Do you follow Gandhiji in other things? Did not Gandhiji ask you to dissolve the Congress Party? Did you follow Gandhiji when you were elected leader of the Congress Party? You did not say that you would not form the Government in the name of the Congress for Gandhiji wanted to dissolve the Congress Party. What did Gandhiji say, two years after the attainment of Independence, about the Governor's salary? You did not quote Gandhiji for getting sanction to the Governor's salary. You did not quote Gandhiji for retaining the sales tax on foodgrains and salt. Are you not aware that Gandhiji wanted that no sales tax should be levied on foodgrains and salt? Did Gandhiji want lands to be distributed to political sufferers? You did not quote Gandhiji when you distributed 5 to 15 acres of land each to 11,000 political sufferers. Why do you quote Gandhiji now? My humble prayer is that the name of Gandhiji should be kept out of present-day politics. Enough damage has already been done by dragging God into politics.

“ Sir, I now come to the taxation proposals. The only question is, whether the people have got the capacity to bear the burden of further taxation. That is the one and only question that faces us. Now, here is a surcharge proposed to be levied on bus fares. In this connexion, I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. Finance Minister through the Hon. Chief Minister who is here to what the previous Finance Minister said. While on this subject of increasing the bus fares, he said: ‘ If people are able to travel by bus, let them travel. Those who have not got the money to travel by bus, let them walk.’ That is what he said, and the people have passed their judgment on his conduct. If this Finance Minister also persists in telling the public that only those who are able to pay should travel in buses and others should walk, I can only remind him of the fate that overtook the previous Finance Minister. Sir, on whom does this tax on bus fares fall? Which class of people will pay this tax. Certainly, many members of the Congress Party and people who have got money will not pay this tax. I am sure, the Hon. Finance Minister will not pay it. The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Gounder will not pay it. The Raja of Chettinad, the Raja of Ramnad, the Raja of Kuruppan, the Zamindar of Edayakottai, the Zamindar of Kapileswarapuram and other big landlords will not pay it. This tax will fall heavily on the workers in factories, peasants, clerks, shop assistants and on the persons who go by the name of ‘ lower middle class people ’. It is that

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

class of people definitely termed as 'donkeys' who will be affected by the increase in the bus fares. Who is to say whether this donkey can bear it or not? Not even the Hon. Minister for Finance, not even the Secretaries to Government, and not even their experts and advisers can say that. The only person who can say whether the donkey can bear it or not is the donkey itself. It's bone is already bent and if another burden is put on its back, the bone will break. Sir, the Hon. Minister for Finance may well ask me: 'All right, you do not want the passengers to pay. Then show me the way to get money. How am I to get this money? My Government needs three to four crores of rupees. Where is the money to come from?' "

JANAB A. M. ALLAPICHAJ:—"Tell them where the money 5 p.m. is?"

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"When the Hon. the Chief Minister asks me, I shall reply. Sir, Prohibition is sought to be retained, because drink is a tax on the poor. The Hon. Finance Minister said in the other House that he is anxious that the poor are not asked to pay and he wants, if possible, to exempt them from paying tax on foodgrains. Sir, regarding Prohibition, it is not a question whether the poor should not be asked to pay. You may justify Prohibition on moral grounds, on religious grounds and divine grounds but not on grounds of material finance.

"Sir, the alternative proposals which I have to submit are as follows: Firstly, eleven thousand assignments of land have been made to political sufferers. Each such assignment consists sometimes of five acres, ten acres and fifteen acres. The value of each acre varies from a thousand rupees to two thousand or two thousand and five hundred rupees. Now we shall put the value of an average assignment of land to political sufferers at Rs. 1,500. Then, the total value of the land given away free to political sufferers amounts to eight crores. I ask the Government to collect from the political sufferers half the value of the lands given free to them. Why do I say this? The Hon. Chief Minister said the other day that he cannot take back the lands from them in the course of interpellations in this House. When I asked him why he cannot bring a legislation for that, he said, he cannot bring such a legislation and he asked me to prepare a Bill. The United Democratic Front will prepare the necessary Bill, it will be a very good legislation when it comes into force. Now, Sir, suppose the Hon. Chief Minister demands from the political sufferers one-half of the value of the lands received free by them, he will get a revenue more than what he wants.

"Again, Sir, under Police, the amount now sought to be spent is the highest in the history of this Province. It is much more than what the previous Minister, Mr. Gopala Reddi spent. He said in this House, 'it is true that we are spending seven crores on the Police; but if only the Communists will come forward and tell us we will not indulge in violence I will spend only five crores.' Sir, whatever you may say about Mr. Gopala Reddi, he is very

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

good in figures. He said, if an assurance is forthcoming from the Communists that they will not indulge in violence, there will be a saving of two crores under Police. Relying on that statement, I ask 'why cannot this Government save that two crores, now that the Communist Party and the U.D.F. Party have committed themselves to a policy of non-violence?' There is no violence in our programme. We are not out to loot police stations, we are not out to break down temples. There is no violence in the programme of the Communists, or the U.D.F. or the Forward Bloc or the Independents. Every Opposition party is now committed to the policy of the United Democratic Front. That being so, cannot Government now reduce Police expenditure by two crores, as suggested by Mr. Gopala Reddi. If only any one of these measures suggested by me is adopted, there will be no need for the sale of jewels for payment of tax or the need for the donkey to cry that its back has been broken; Government can run the administration with the funds they already have and with the moneys suggested by me.

"Then, Sir, I have to submit that in our State we should adopt and follow high principles of democracy. I have no time to expatiate on it. So I shall deal briefly with it here. Sir, at present, democracy does not exist in this State. We must take note of that fact. We see that Government is entrusted to a person, a nominated person, to one who has not come through the vote of the people. In a true democracy the person who runs the administration or the Government is one who has been elected by the people. Does that obtain in our State? Then there is no joint responsibility in the Cabinet. In a true democracy, the Cabinet as a whole decides every issue and takes the responsibility for its decision. Now, can any one say that obtains in this State? The issue of Prohibition is decided not by the Cabinet but by the Chief Minister. Can anyone say that Cabinet responsibility exists? Mr. Manickavelu Naicker, as leader of the Commonwealth party, before he became Minister has stated categorically that he would put down Prohibition as it had caused untold miseries to the country. He has given that undertaking; he has given it in writing; he has signed it as his pledge that he will try to build up Dravidastan and put down Prohibition. Now, was he consulted by the other Members of the Cabinet when they decided the Prohibition issue? Is this the way of fixing joint responsibility of the Cabinet? There must be some understanding among the Members of the Cabinet. Then, again, take another instance. The Hon. Revenue Minister said repeatedly that lands given away to political sufferers will be got back. How does he propose to do it in the face of the repeated statements to the contrary made by the Chief Minister in both Houses of Legislature? Where is the joint responsibility in the Cabinet? If it is a coalition ministry I can understand it. Now, everything is being done by the Hon. Chief Minister. I am saying this in the interest of true democracy. I am not asking that our Chief Minister should follow the example of the Bombay Chief Minister, who after getting himself nominated to the Council first, stood for election in one constituency

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

and got returned. I concede, if our Chief Minister stood for election in some constituency, he would succeed. I am not saying, he cannot succeed. In the interest of true democracy, I want the people to see that the Government observe the principles of democracy and not merely pay lip service to it. We find in every subject that it is the Chief Minister who decides and not the other Ministers. If it is the subject of Prohibition, it is not the Hon. Minister, Mr. Palaniswami Gounder, the Minister for Prohibition, who has the final say in the matter, but it is the Chief Minister, who says: 'I stand or fall by Prohibition.' If control of food-grains is to go, it is the intuition of the Chief Minister that decides it. If the lands given to political sufferers are to be got back, it is not the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue that decides the matter, but it is the Chief Minister who decides it. So, I suggest that we must try to preserve some semblance of democracy.

"Then, Sir, a lot has been said about Communists. It is very often said that if the Congress does not rule the State, the Communists will come to power and there will be chaos. The Chief Minister is never tired of saying it. If only the Chief Minister should utter the word 'Communism' then immediately a set of people take to their heels because of fright. We are never frightened. There are some people like Dr. Nathamuni Naidu who, on hearing the word 'Communism', rush out and take shelter in police stations. It is not all people who are frightened by that word. It does frighten Rajahs, inamdars, feudal landlords, employers of labour and mill-owners. It does not frighten the common man. It does not frighten the ordinary people, the workers, the office employees, clerks and teachers. These people are not afraid of Communism. They are prepared to welcome Communism; they are prepared to vote for Communism.

"Now there is a talk of violence being adopted by the Opposition as Communists have joined the U.D.F. I can assure the House that there is no violence contemplated by the Opposition. Why should we commit violence? I go to a meeting and address them; the people are prepared to support and vote for my Communist friends. Why should I commit violence over the people whom we wish to serve? Why should I injure a man who is prepared to support me and vote for me? Then, Sir, there was a lot said about Russian money coming to us. The Hon. Finance Minister, who is not here now, said yesterday, 'You get money from Russia.' Another member said that he knew that some unknown person had sent an unknown sum of money which he refused to receive. That, according to him, is sufficient evidence to show that money is coming to us from Russia. The United Democratic Front knows it does not get money. 'Then where do you get money?' you may ask. It is true we are able to spend on elections as much money as the Congress Party. I shall tell you where the money comes from. People pay us. In the Aruppukottai constituency, when I first went there to work in that constituency, I found that the contesting candidate had not held a single meeting. He did not know what to do. He said, he had no money. I told him, 'Here is the money' and offered him some money. We held meetings. On the first

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

day of the meeting, I appealed to the people saying 'Here is the U.D.F. candidate; he has come to you to seek your vote; he has not the power of the Government; he has not the power of the Press; he has not the power of the purse.' I asked the people to pay for his election expenses. They paid him immediately; they paid him his expenses not only for that meeting but also for the next meeting. If the Chief Minister has any doubt, let him come and see. I am holding a meeting next Sunday in the beach. The people will pay the expenses of that meeting and also something to spare. If Dr. Nathamuni Naidu has any doubt, he can come to the beach on Sunday next and see where the money for our expenses comes from, where the money for our propaganda comes from.

"Then, Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister said that if the Congress does not rule this State, there would be chaos. He is never tired of repeating, if he does not rule, if the Congress does not rule this State there would be chaos. Probably he has not read the U.D.F. and the Communist programme. We have got together a ready-made programme."

JANAB A. M. ALLAPICHAI:—"What about the Communist programme?"

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"The Communist Party and the U.D.F. have produced a joint programme. This programme is our Holy Bible; this is our Ramayana; this is our Gita. We have a common programme. The Hon. Chief Minister says, 'if the Congress does not rule this State there will be chaos; if I do not rule over it, there will be chaos.' I ask in all humility, 'Did not the British say the same thing; did they not say: if we leave the country there will be chaos.' Now it is those very words the Hon. Chief Minister is saying. That is the language of the imperialist. Are you not saying exactly what the British were saying. The British were saying that because they wanted to rule this country. Now you are using their very words because the Congress wants to rule this State. And did, what they said, happen? When the British left this country, was there chaos? No, there was no chaos. Even so, if the Congress does not rule this State there will be no chaos, no confusion.

"Then, Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister said in a certain place, I do not remember where, 'even if I were to accept the programme of the U.D.F. the opposition from the U.D.F. will persist.' Sir, let me declare here and now to the Chief Minister—I have got the authority from Mr. Rajeswara Rao and others of the party—if the Chief Minister accepts the U.D.F. programme we shall cease to oppose his Government; we will not say that he should resign. I ask him to put into force the U.D.F. programme to see the truth of this. Sir, as a person who has had a hand in the drafting of the U.D.F. programme, I say to the Chief Minister, he need not accept the whole of the programme. There is one pivotal article in that programme. I shall be satisfied if he accepts it. The pivotal point is that the Government should take the

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

responsibility for providing employment for those who are not given employment and that Government should give food and shelter to those who are not given employment.

“ But that simple principle is not acceptable to the Congress Government. The other day also a newspaper reporter put a question to the Hon. the Chief Minister ‘ Why he could not accept such a simple thing as to guarantee a living for everybody so that we could keep life going? ’ My object in asking that he should accept this very small and simple thing is that when the Congress Government comes to an end and the United Democratic Front takes over, there may be some people left alive.

5-15
p.m.

“ What is the position to-day of those who have not got any work? Have this Government shown some way to the people who have no work? They have not. According to the Finance Minister's speech, even the gruel centres are not open to them. The gruel centres are open only to those who are infirm and sick. Able-bodied people, even though they are unemployed, are not entitled to this benefit. One must get infirm before he gets the right to the benefit of the gruel centre! Sir, able-bodied men are entitled to be given work. I will mention an incident which occurred when the Hon. Shri K. M. Munshi visited Rayalaseema as Food Minister of the Government of India. He attended a gruel centre. There were a number of people waiting to get their gruel and among the large number of infirm and decrepit people, he saw one able-bodied man. The Food Minister told him that he was not entitled to the benefit because he was able-bodied and asked that he should be removed. That man told Mr. Munshi ‘ It is not as if, Sir, I am here by my choice but I have not got any work. Give me work and I am prepared to work. If you are not prepared to take the responsibility of giving us work, we have only got to beg. ’ Recently, Sir, there was a case in Madurai of one Rayappan who was employed in a cloth shop while the business was good. When he lost his employment, he had nothing to do. He went from place to place in search of employment but he could not find any. So one day he gave poison to his wife, to two of his children and also poisoned himself. He left a letter in which he said, ‘ I have no employment and this place is not fit for poor people to live. Therefore I leave my life in the hands of God. ’ I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister as to what is to happen to these persons who are not able to find employment for themselves. I suppose the Government are aware that to-day more than 20,000 persons from various districts in Tamilnad are rotting helplessly in the streets of Nellore town in search of employment. There is no one to care for the people in the villages. There is a village in Kovilpatti taluk in which out of 60 houses 40 houses are empty. The people have gone away in search of employment. This Government takes no responsibility. The only course which this Government shows to the persons who are not able to get work is the way to Paradise! The Hon. Chief Minister may ask ‘ If all people are to be given work, will this earth become a paradise? ’ Sir, I have not seen a paradise. I am not an authority on it. But,

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[11th July 1952]

I have seen several countries in the world. I have lived in Britain for many years. Britain is supposed to be a civilised country where the Government takes the responsibility to provide employment to every adult citizen."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The hon. Member's time is up."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I hope, Sir, the Chief Minister has no objection to my taking some more time."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I will give the hon. Member five more minutes."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" Sir, on the question of belief in God, because the Hon. the Chief Minister talks every time of God and has brought God into politics, I must clarify the attitude of the United Democratic Front on this subject. You (to the Hon. Chief Minister) will never get us to cross swords with you on the issue of God. Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are not going to argue with the Hon. the Chief Minister. If he says there is God in the rivers, in the mountains and in the oceans, we say 'All right, let it be so'. If he says there is God in the smallest fibre and in the biggest pillar, we say 'Let it be so.' What I ask is, if that Omnipotent, Omnipresent God is present here in rice, then give that rice to my people who are now going without food; if that Omnipotent and Omnipresent God is present here in cloth, then give that cloth to my people and if that Omnipotent and Omnipresent God is present in the shape of employment, wages, and shelter in the shape of huts, give these to my people. Even if E. V. Ramaswami Periyar says there is no God in food, we want only food whether there is God in it or not. We are not concerned with whether there is God or not and we are not prepared to enter into a dispute on that. The Hon. the Chief Minister tried to drag some of us into a dispute by saying 'Oh, you have now changed. Now, you are not saying there is no God.' There is a God in whom everybody believes. Do I believe in God? It is a secret between me and my God. It is not for exhibition or display here. To us in the United Democratic Front there are far more important things.

" Though the Hon. Chief Minister might dispose of me by saying 'My boy, you are not experienced', I must put forward my programme. If the Hon. Chief Minister is not prepared to hand over the Government to the United Democratic Front, let him put us in charge of a district and we will show him how we will work. We accept that every man is entitled to a decent employment or food. The Hon. Chief Minister is not prepared to accept it. We are prepared to run the Government on this basis. My hon. Friend, the Chief Minister, will ask what will I do if the United Democratic Front gets into power. We will not be sitting here; we will not be going by first-class to Mathurai for the Meenakshi temple or by special train to Rameswaram. We will start big and heavy industries. There was an hon. Member from the Krishak Lok Party who said that the largest asset which we

11th July 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

have in the State is the lignite deposits within hundred miles of Madras. We have got thousands of millions of tons of lignite. Why cannot we go there and employ ten thousand persons? I will go there and the United Democratic Front will not be going round receiving garlands and congratulations. There are iron ores in our State. The Japanese Delegation which recently came to this country wanted to carry these ores to Japan to give employment to their people. If they can do it, why can we not do it.

"My Friend Nathamuni Naidu talked about leadership of the world. Are we inferior to the other people in intellect? If 10,000 people could be employed usefully in Japan on Rs. 150 per month, if the Indian ores are taken to Japan, we can also do that. We can exploit our iron as well as aluminium ores. We can start more factories and enlarge our shipbuilding industry and in many other ways give employment to our people on decent wages. Sir, I can tell the Hon. the Chief Minister that there will be no chaos. We have got a plan. We can undertake to see that all our people are given employment on decent wages or given food. It was not my intention, Sir, to hurt the feelings of the Hon. the Chief Minister or the Hon. the Finance Minister. My only intention was to give him some food for thought. I can tell him that if he ceases to rule over us—as some day he must—he can find peace of mind in the fact that the Government will pass into the hands of people who will be well able to administer and well able to give people employment, wages, shelter, food and cloth. People are now roaming in the streets without the basic necessities of life. They are roaming about foodless, clothless, houseless, moneyless and workless. Something must be done for the people and we have shown what our plan is. Sir, if the Hon. the Chief Minister would only admit that there is another line of thought, that there is another line of reasoning whatever may be his own reasoning, I am satisfied that I have not spoken in vain. The day he returned from Rayalaseema, he said 'in the background of the poverty, in the background of the misery and distress of the people all else looks to me a mockery'. There he has just touched the basic core of the United Democratic Front.

"Sir, if I have succeeded in touching a cell in his able brain and it is now on a new line of thought, or if I have touched a chord in his heart which makes him act in a different way, I have succeeded in my object. If only I have given him some food for thought, I have not spoken in vain."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, the appeal made by my hon. Friend at the closing of his speech deserves first attention. If really the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition in this House, Sri Adityan wanted to 'touch a chord in my heart or a cell in my brain' he should have employed, I suggest, a different style and a better standard of good taste and manner of expression even, if I may be permitted to say so."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—"I do not think there was anything unparliamentary in my language, Sir."

[11th July 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, it is not a question of parliamentary language but it is a question of ‘touching my heart’. My misfortune in becoming Chief Minister here is large. I do not want to appeal for pity but I am describing a fact. I find to-day and I feel the greatest part of that misfortune is that I should sit on this side of the Table when a speech like the one just now was to be made on the other side of the Table. There is a certain standard of decency in debate. There is a certain standard of good taste. Nobody objects to the most unpleasant facts being brought out but there are such things as standards of taste and decency. My hon. Friend may not be aware of any error on his part in this connexion. I am sure he would not commit the error if he felt it but the greatest misfortune is that he is not aware of what I complain about. He is just continuing to speak as, I am sorry to have to say, he is writing in his paper. Even if we have a double function or profession to perform we must observe the decencies of each particular profession. Here, as Leader of the Opposition, he occupies a most responsible position, a position of dignity and prestige.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ On a point of order, Sir, I cannot agree to the allegation of irresponsibility. I am to point out, Sir, that it is altogether out of place.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The hon. Member must know when to interrupt.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Sir, I am rising on a point of order. (Sri K. Bhashyam was also seen to rise on a point of order.) Under the general rules every speech must be strictly relevant to the discussion and under rule 55 of the Council Rules a member while speaking must not make a personal charge against another member. Here is a charge made that I as Leader of the Opposition have not acted in a responsible manner. I submit, Sir, that according to the rules he cannot make such an allegation. It is entirely out of order to make such a suggestion.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I repeat that the biggest misfortune among the many attendant on my holding this office is—I have heard many speeches in opposition, I have heard violent speeches in opposition and it is a pleasure sometimes to hear violent opposition—to hear speeches such as has been made just now which is a painful thing. I have no doubt whatsoever that it is an error of habit on his part but let me go to the point.

“ What is it that he is claiming? He is claiming that if power should be transferred to him, if he is made Chief Minister and his Party supports him with a majority in the House, he will immediately increase the salaries of all the low-paid officers to whom he referred. Not only those who are called usually non-gazetted officers but all inferior, menial and other servants who bear these adjectives will all be given a higher basic salary and, as soon as

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

I resign and Adityan becomes Chief Minister with his party behind him, there will be no unemployment in the country, everybody will be employed and everybody will receive better pay and the food position also will improve. Control and decontrol will walk together hand in hand. There will be freedom of decontrol and also full control on prices, in fact, no control because everything will be cheap. All these will happen. I have no doubt, Sir, that any man can boast anything but the question is whether people will believe him. It is easy to boast but it is another question whether that boast will pass. That we are underpaying people, that we have not found scope for full employment for all our citizens in this country or in this State are perfectly true charges. To the extent that the facts warrant those charges, I plead guilty. In fact, why I struggle, why my party struggles and why the Congress struggles, is because they admit that the country is poor and that nearly everybody is miserable, but the presentation of the actual facts does not amount to a charge. We are struggling against these facts and the question is, 'who will succeed to a reasonable extent in redressing these grievances and in reducing these miseries?' The answer must be given from time to time by the electorate. A Budget debate should not be simply a boast, a re-boast and a counter-boast. We have to find out exactly what is reasonable, what has been done and what can be done. I do not imagine that these charges that have been made are really charges made as charges. I know and I shall describe why they have been made. As I understand it these suggestions have been made because it is the business of Mr. Adityan and his friends continually to tell everybody, who is drawing a salary under the Government, that his salary should be raised, continually to tell everyone that he should keep on discontented and not remain contented till things are bettered. It is the business of agitation. No doubt, it is lawful business for a political agitator but that takes people nowhere. It seems to be his business to make governance difficult for the Government that is in power. It is his business now to say 'You must raise salaries; you must increase expenditure but you must also reduce expenditure.'

"He thinks he has made a brilliant point when he says that the Governor's establishment costs so much. In this argument, I make a complete present of the entire cost of the Governor's establishment and distribute it among the people in this State. Would he be able to alter anything? Now, he may come back to the point that it will be something psychological. Psychological gains are not what he seeks. It is for the Government in power to get some psychological gain out of it. The argument of the Opposition is that employment must be increased so that everybody may have employment and every servant must get a salary on which he could live decently. Now, if only the principles that he has enunciated in his speech are accepted and the salary that should be given is multiplied by the number of people that are to receive them, he will find that the Budget will have to be increased, not twice or thrice, but it has to be increased ten times. We have to find the resources for meeting this expenditure.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

5-30
p.m.

" I do not say that there is no ideal to work for. We have all ideals to work for, but we must be practical men when we are dealing with the affairs of Government. What is it that Mr. Adityan has been declaiming about? It is easy to write a leading newspaper article or even to get a third-rate artist to write a cartoon. It is easy to paint a donkey and put me in charge of it or paint me as a donkey. I tried all these things when I was much younger than Mr. Adityan. All that is quite easy. The point, now, is whether there is any substance in what has been said by Mr. Adityan? The expenditure on the Governor's establishment is a point which can be pointed out in every debate. But we have not done it as a new thing. We have not done it in Madras only. It is a general policy for the whole of India. We do or we do not want Governors. If we do want Governors, we want them to occupy a particular position. All these have been thoroughly discussed in the Constituent Assembly. We can dispense with a King but we must have a President. We can even dispense with a President, but there must be somebody to be the linchpin to keep the axle and the wheel together. We must have somebody to dissolve the Assembly or to issue summonses for the Assembly. All these things have to be done by somebody and not by putting a constable in the Government House and asking him to run the Governorship. It is impossible. There are certain things as Mr. Adityan wearing a coat. Can Mr. Adityan wear a coat without a shirt or a tie without a shirt? A button must be there. Everything must be there in its place. We cannot simply denounce the Government giving figures of expenditure on the Governor's establishment. There are countries where there are no Governors. They are tiny little countries. They are not countries as large as India with the heterogeneity of our population and with several States, like ours, kept in Union. We must have a certain kind of establishment and a certain quantum of establishment for maintaining the Constitution. This is not our subject. We have discussed it for all India and the thing has been settled. (Interruption from Mr. Rajeswara Rao.) Please do not interrupt me. You will only give me a further argument.

" The aim of the Communist Party is that the Congress must be killed. They have joined together in the U.D.F. They say, we shall talk only of salaries. We shall not talk of revolution, class-war, property, collectivism and things of that kind. They say to the Non-Gazetted officers: ' My dear Non-Gazetted officers, don't you want more salary? If so, support us.' They go to the *Chap-rasis* and tell them: ' Don't you want more salary? We will support your case. Support us.' I tell the *Chap-rasis* and the Non-Gazetted officers and others: ' If you place your fortunes in the hands of Mr. Adityan, you will be ruined.' All these boasts will come to mere air and nothing else. That is what I say. I hope it is parliamentary language. I do not wish to hurt the feelings of anybody. That is my general parliamentary practice. I have got to answer all the points I have heard.

" The Governor's establishment is a thing that is necessary. We may modify it but we have to modify it in a particular way.

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

and in a particular manner and for the whole of India. It is not a thing that can be done, on a debate on the Budget in this Assembly. That is the only thing about it, and I will not go into the question of good tastes and good manners in this connection. If you do want an umbrella over your head, you should not make holes in that umbrella. If a Governor is to be there, he should be there as Governor respected by all parties and he must be there with a certain prestige and with a certain moral authority surrounding him. He is not like a constable or a clerk whom you can appoint or dismiss or reappoint or suspend or issue notice to prosecute. The post of a Governor is a peculiar office and with full understanding of its importance, the Constitution of our country has kept the Governors going, has kept the President going and has kept certain forms going. In the Legislative Assembly, why are we—Legislative Assembly Members—paid? Why is the Assembly housed in the building like the one in which it is now housed? All these things may be unnecessary. Surely we can meet in a hut and discuss all our business. But certain forms are necessary in this world.

“ Then my hon. Friend said that since the Communists have settled down to Parliamentary life we should immediately reduce the expenditure on Police. Yes, by and by, we shall do so. It is not merely a question of belief or non-belief. There is a certain amount of expediency behind this policy of parliamentary method which the Communists are now following. I want that to grow into a habit. I want the Gentleman who wants to pretend to be a *sanyasi* to sit down for a day, for a month or for a year, habituating himself to put his fingers on the nose and then we will see whether he becomes a real *sanyasi* or not. I want the Communists and I do hope that, in course of time, they will settle down to Parliamentary method. There is no good Mr. Rajeswara Rao writing to his masters or to his colleagues in the Polit Bureau: ‘ This is only a temporary phase. This is only an expediency. We do not give up our policy that the State must be taken by force, and not otherwise, and that there is no chance for the Communist way of life without a forcible revolution.’ There is no good in writing that. If I have the leisure—Mr. Rajeswara Rao may know later—I will go to the Communist countries and expose the present expediency politics of Communists on their behalf. It is expediency now. It is not yet a full, conscious and sincere belief in parliamentary methods. I know, later, it may become a habit. I do hope that the Communists will not be able to get out of the mire of parliamentary life. I hope they will be struck by it. I am hoping for that day when they will become a true Parliamentary Opposition. Then I will reduce expenditure on Police, if I have the authority to do so at that time; and not now. I know, that you can go back on your methods but I cannot go back. At the present stage, we will have to watch one another’s sincerity, one another’s behaviour. All these are necessary before Mr. Adityan can persuade me to reduce the expenditure on the Police.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

"The expenditure in all departments, whether it be Police or whether it be Women's Welfare or whether it be Defence, is naturally increasing from year to year. As population increases from year to year, as prices increase, as difficulties increase there is always an addition and never a subtraction. It is part of our civilization. We can observe it even in our family budgets. Therefore there is nothing very remarkable to find that in the year 1952 a little more money is to be spent than in the year 1951. In fact, if you do not spend, people will find fault with you.

5-45
P.m.

"To spend on an item while there is need for it is not a crime. There is greed and a great increase in the volume of crime in every aspect and department of crime and the methods and technique of crime have also advanced. There are criminals now who walk with revolvers in their hands and there are others who pretend to be Communists and go with revolvers in their hands and the Communists will support me in any action that I might take with reference to them because it is not they but somebody else who suffers. As a matter of fact, people now pretend to be Communists in order to extort and intimidate and so the request of the Leader of the Opposition to reduce the number of Police stations cannot be carried out. He may say that the people do not want them. I know, Sir, that the people want more Police stations; it may be that the voters who gave votes to the Leader of the Opposition may want the Police stations to go but, so far as the generality of people are concerned, they do not want the Police establishment to be reduced but they want it to be stronger. Therefore, we do want the Police and we cannot do without it."

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—"Why not decide it on the basis of a referendum?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"A referendum for each issue is not known in our country and further a referendum on one issue might cut across another issue and that is a thing which is not within our province.

"Now, let us take the question of Cabinet responsibility. Mr. Adityan thought that he was exceedingly smart—it is not unparliamentary—in putting up Sri Manickavelu Naicker to imagine that he is badly treated by me, that I am carrying on with my policy and exploiting him; all this is smart, nothing less. I would submit that the remarks that he made about joint responsibility is the answer to this smart remark. The more dissimilar the people in the Cabinet are, the better it is for the country if there is joint responsibility. I believe in people getting together working upon each other's judgment and discretion so that we might get results for which we are responsible, for which every one in the cabinet is responsible. One hon. Member said that Prohibition should either be enforced or be repealed; the enforcement is not good and therefore, it must go. He can say so many other things but it will not do for Sri Adityan to try to set up one against the other in our Cabinet. He will not succeed and the attempt is not decent.

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

"Sir, I will take up the question of decontrol separately. I am trying to forget his last speech and I do not want to end this debate in an angry state of mind which has been provoked by Sri Adityan. If he wanted to make me angry, he has succeeded. I confess that it is not right for anyone to lose his temper but there is a limit to even an old man's patience.

"I am grateful for all the helpful remarks and criticisms made by hon. Members during the last few days. The very fact that in this House there is no question of voting of any kind has clothed the remarks made in this House with a certain amount of freedom, richness and fullness of expression. I welcome it and it is a great advantage. We can vote according to groups or parties or according to individual judgment but a debate like this in this House has its own advantages where there is no voting and members can join together and say 'Yes' to certain things and 'No' to some others.

"In the first instance, I am grateful, in spite of what Sri Adityan has said, for the approval of the Opposition in respect of the most important step taken by the Government in regard to the food policy. On the whole, people have appreciated it and Members of this House have also appreciated it and, even on the Opposition, Sri Adityan tried not to say that decontrol was bad but he said that decontrol can walk hand in hand with control and to this I shall refer later. People have appreciated my courage but let me say that this was not my courage; it is not my courage that made me give up controls; it is the courage of the people that infected me because people are ready to take risks, they are willing to take risks and they prefer taking them to the harassments and the troubles that they have to go through under controls. It is that courage which I sensed among most of our people that gave me the courage. I do not claim any courage on my part when I know I have drawn the whole of that courage from the people for whom I have to work. Therefore, it is unnecessary for people to compliment me on it or for other people to try to prove it to be wrong or to argue that my courage has not been demonstrated. Mr. Prakasam who is here said 'What is there tremendous in decontrol?' He referred to the sufferings he had seen and went through helplessly under control. Decontrol, he explained, came out of the very nature of things and not out of my skill or statesmanship or anything great on my part. It is quite right as everything comes out of the nature of things. Can I change the laws of nature? We have only to act according to the laws of nature. Sri Prakasam said that this was long overdue and there is nothing terrible in my having done it. Mr. Burra, I am sorry, I have used the shortened form of his name, Sri Subrahmanyam said that courage cannotes risk and asked: 'Without risk, where is the courage? What was the great risk when you had good stocks held on Government accounts? You have taken no risk and you have done nothing brave.' True, quite correct but I do not know why he argues this at all. Who wanted compliments for having taken the risk? Some people say that I took a risk and some others say there is no such thing. It should not be mistaken

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

that I claimed a compliment for courage or anything of the kind. Sri Subrahmanyam need not have gone so far to prove that I was not brave. There are very many ways of proving it just as people used to do in the olden days going out with a pistol in hand for a duel and settling the matter. Let it be granted there is no courage involved here or of taking risks. Indeed I do wish there were no risks and that is my claim and desire. Far from disagreeing with him, I want him to prove that there is no risk whatsoever and that we have adequate stocks on hand and everything will move all right. I say that I did not order decontrol in order to get cheers from a circus crowd, where a performer takes risks and comes out successful. I decontrolled to give freedom to the toiling farmer and to restore to him the sense of honest ownership of what he raised through the sweat of his brow and that of his wife and children. I did not do it to get Sri Burra's compliment or the admiration of anybody else. Do I not know the value of human praise or the opposite of it? Have I not read and reflected on the meditations of Marcus Aurelius? He taught me the utter valuelessness of public praise. I am glad Sri Burra tells me that there was no risk. Let us work together to reduce risks and make the freedom of the farmer a reality and a success. Let not Members of the Opposition continuously wish in their hearts to get some bad news about this. Let them not pray, to the extent that they believe in praying, for news of failure in that respect. By all means let Sri Adityan prove me to have failed when I have failed, but let not Members of the Opposition cherish and wish alarmist news to the point of satisfaction to themselves.

"I know the fundamental creed of Communism is regulation and control—I am not referring to the famous United Democratic Front programme, but I am referring to the standing programme of the Communists, their standing creed and the basis of their philosophy. Take any book on Communism or Socialism and you will see that the first chapter deals with the need for regulated production and regulated distribution. My Friend Sri Satyanarayana will tell you, Sir, that I explained this to him 20 years ago and he asked me if co-operation will not do and I answered him, but he still stands firm. Now the first chapter in any book on Communism deals with regulated production and distribution and it is a different matter whether we can do it or not. But the farmers of this land do not like the corollary to this regulation of production and distribution; they do not like the enslavement of the individual; they do not like official harassment which is a corollary to any Government trying to control. Of course when the Communists take over the State, they will have liquidated all opposition and every citizen will be a Policeman, every surviving citizen will be a Policeman; every father will be a spy on the son and every son will be a spy on the father and everybody will be the servant of the State and therefore, there will be no difficulty or danger; the very urge of life would be changed and different. Today the Communists have suppressed their creed. I am explaining their reaction to the success or failure of decontrol. The Communists have suppressed their fundamental doctrine but it cannot

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

be suppressed so easily. The Communist doctrine of regulation of production and distribution is not wanted in the G.C.M. programme of the United Democratic Front. It can be suppressed but it finds an outlet in their hearts whenever the occasion arises and that is why a large number of Members of the Opposition want the failure of decontrol and desire that decontrol should be proved wrong and the original philosophy of the Communists should be proved correct, namely, that control over production and distribution is necessary for life whether in India or elsewhere because the Communist doctrine is an international doctrine and it applies to all lands. I beg of them to make the temporary subordination of their creed a habit and a reality, and I want you to wish in your hearts for no failure of this policy, for the sake of the people of this land and not for my sake. Sri Adityan said that decontrol has been proved to be a failure. He could wait for some time till it has sufficiently been proved to have been a failure.

“ He referred to a speech which I made in Anantapur, probably, soon after the decontrol broadcast. Cannot Mr. Adityan understand that there is such a thing as propaganda and an appeal to the people to make the policy a success. I have to tell the people—who else can tell them better than I—after I have given that broadcast: ‘Here your honesty is challenged and it must be proved and your patriotism must stand proved; the challenge has been made and you must respond properly; you must be honest, straight and make decontrol a success. Remember that when you do anything dishonest, you may make some money out of it but it means that you would be making decontrol a failure; you make your Chief Minister a failure.’ I appealed not only in Anantapur, I appealed in private and public meetings and elsewhere also that if they want me or if they want the Congress to govern, they ought to make this policy a success. Whenever I say I will go, it is a sanction which I apply to my friends, not to my opponents, no doubt the public and everybody may read the sanction that I apply against my friends or relations or blood relations or party friends or of people who have some affection for me. Every time that I say that I will give up my office, Sri Adityan’s mouth seems to water.

“ Sir, this is a wrong interpretation of what I said to the public. If I tell my washerman—I did not tell him, but for argument’s sake, if I say—‘My dear friend, everybody should work honestly. If you undertake a piece of work, you must do it properly. If you want me to govern this country, everybody should work like that’, does it mean that if the washerman does not wash my clothes well, I should resign and Mr. Adityan must take my place. I am surprised at the terrible desire that has developed in the Opposition mind that the Chief Minister should resign. I do not mind it. I am only too eager to be relieved. Whether I succeed or not, let us understand one another when we speak. A verse in the *Bhagavad Gita* says that inordinate desire ruins one’s intellect. ‘If you allow your desire to become too strong and to overwhelm you, your intellect will be ruined.’ The gradual

6 p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

process is described very beautifully in the *Gita*, step by step, now it will in the end lead to complete disaster. Do not allow the desire that the Chief Minister should resign, overwhelm you. How long will I last, even if I do not resign? Do not read in every speech of mine an opportunity for getting the Chief Minister out of the way. I can understand the politics that had led to that desire which is not relevant to this case. We all know that Mr. Adityan was not always in the United Democratic Front. We all know Mr. Adityan's several successes and several failures. Mr. Adityan says, 'come to my meeting. You will see, all the people subscribing for the expenses of the meeting.' I want him not to get deceived by such exhibitions, whether it be on the one side or the other. It is the same truth. Let us not care so much for public praise or blame. Let us try to do the right thing.

"Then, Sir, about appreciations of certain concessions given to inadequately paid officials, I wish to say that a thing repeated loses its beauty and its grace. I do not like anyone to compliment me on these concessions. They are nothing. They are small. I know how small they are against the background of the distress of modern middle-class life. It is painful to me to listen to compliments in this matter. Let us leave these concessions alone for what they are worth. I believe, they are good for the children of those families. I do not want compliments on that account. I wish to say one thing that has been lost sight of in this connection. The term 'N.G.O.' has come to mean something very specific. But the order making boys and girls free scholars in all schools applies not only to sons and daughters of Superintendents and Upper and Lower Division Clerks of the Secretariat in Madras, but to the children of every Government servant including the lowest grade of Taluk Office Clerks, peons, Constables, Head Constables—every menial or inferior servant so called, provided he is on the pay list of this Government. This is a big sweep, I claim in my heart. I do not want any compliment for it but I do hope that this big sweep will be appreciated.

"Every good act leaves behind a large remnant of things not done. It is easy to point out that there is so much not done. But let us hope we shall be able to do more and more, and not try to darken the good things done with accusations about what has not yet been done. Let us improve our national income first and then all priorities can be attended to. Not until then. We cannot simply by a Budget trick provide employment and salaries to everybody, whatever Government may be in power. It is only by an increase in the national income that we can do that and that is why so much stress is laid on capital expenditure. That is why the capital expenditure in any State is its greatest hope. For, on this and on the improvement of national character and habits, whether it be voluntary or brought about by regulations, depend the increase of national income and the fulfilment of our hopes. So there is no use in finding fault with the Budget or with the Chief Minister or with the Finance Minister, if there is large unemployment in our country.

11th July 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

" Much stress was laid by some Members on the just and natural desire of the people of the Andhra districts to become a separate State instead of losing their identity in this mixed State of Madras. It was Mr. Venkata Rao who spoke on it with great feeling. Every one who has worked with me during these past 30 years knows that I sympathise with this desire and have helped towards its fulfilment. There is no need for anyone to press on me the expediency of this partition. Because I am a Mitakshara-minded man, I do not believe in holding together those who wish to separate. When any undivided member expresses a clear desire to separate, it is better to separate than to hold fast to an unwanted partnership. That is the reason—it is not as if I do not like the Andhra company—why I support this desire for separation. No one, therefore, need doubt my mind, but things must be done properly and at the right time. The cry for partition has been used by some as a weapon for the advancement of party politics. This, I thoroughly dislike. This is wrong and dangerous. People who wish to use the popular demand for party purposes wish rather to keep the demand alive than to obtain its fulfilment quickly, because for party purposes the demand is more important than its fulfilment. And so it is that claims are added on, which are impossible of fulfilment, so that the issue may be kept alive and furnish strength to party politics. This desire for a separate State need not be allowed to cast its cloud on our affairs in this State. That is my appeal. Let us leave it to the impartial consideration of the President's Government and while we are together, let us carry on our work without mutual suspicion.

" An issue has been raised, I might say in this connection, over the Krishna waters. It threatens to become worse than communal and religious animosity. I see it as clear as daylight. Let us carry on without anger and for mutual advantage in a spirit of calm reflection on every important national issue and not get excited over these things. I deprecate any excitement over an issue of this kind. Let us not quarrel over the chickens before they are hatched. The Krishna water is not yet there for sharing. It had to be decided in Delhi between Bombay and the Central Government how much water we should have. Let us look after the hen which is to lay its eggs and not quarrel over unhatched eggs.

" Sir, the other day reference was made, almost to blood flowing over the Krishna waters. No reference was made to blood but the word 'drop' was used in a tone and style which reminded me of blood. I deprecate such excitement over an issue of this kind. When it is a question of serving humanity the resources of the world should be used to the best advantage of the people as a whole. It does not matter whether it is here or there. The old doctrines are changing. When things are proposed and discussed, we can present our case and we can dispose of it; and sacrifices would be made on behalf of everybody. We do not want the water to go into the sea. We want it to be utilized for the benefit of hungry people.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

"Some criticisms were offered with regard to the Prohibition policy, weakness of enforcement and the desirability of looking into the matter with a view to improve enforcement or to repeal the Prohibition Act and re-introduce alcoholic drinks in this State as in the old days. The Budget has been prepared on the assumption that we do not get any drink revenue as under the old Abkari system. The Government are pledged to their policy of Prohibition under Article 47 of the Constitution. We believe that it would be unjust to offer toddy and arrack to the most miserable in the land and put a heavy price on it and thereby make revenue. About the attraction of drink, I know quite enough. I have lived among the addicts. I need not, however, now describe my experience. I know the attraction of drink is due to want of joy in the life of the poor man and to the social conditions under which he lives. I am not referring to the gentlemen who drink in clubs, who use bottled drinks imported from abroad. I am referring to the main source of revenue from drink, which is from the common man who uses toddy and arrack. If it is agreed that it is the poor that will mostly consume what is not good for them, how could we justly put an indirect tax on the poorest section of the people in order to find revenues to meet our expenditure? I can understand making drink free if it were not considered dangerous. I can understand making it available to those who want it and I can understand many things."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"Then why tax foodgrains, if it is a question of helping the poor?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I have not forgotten it and I shall refer to it. A tax on food affects every one in the land. Food is eaten by everybody and it is not poisonous. Whereas drink is consumed by a few people and it is poisonous. Also, in the case of drink, the burden does not fall on those who keep away from drink. If I put the tax on toddy, I specifically tax a certain class of people whose miserable faces stand before me and I cannot agree to put an indirect tax on toddy to make it costly and use that money for other people's benefit. If I tax food, I tax everybody. In the case of food, one cannot eat more than he wants. But in the case of drink, one can drink more than he wants and he can ruin his family. Therefore, a tax on drink is very different from a tax on food. If a member of Mr. Adityan's family began to drink, then he would understand what I have said. (Laughter.)

Sir, the word 'tainted money' is a popular phrase but a thing that is too often repeated loses its meaning. It becomes a mere *mantram*. It is not a *mantram* but it expresses the reality of the injustice that is involved in the drink tax. That is why it is called 'tainted money'. It is not as if it is a branch of untouchability that we should not touch the money got in that way. It is injustice that is involved in the tax.

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“ There is a popular fallacy and a great deal of argument is based on it that liquor licitly made is good for health and liquor is bad for health if it is made illicitly. Liquor is bad, whether it be Government liquor or whether it be illicit liquor. If to-day people can get only poisonous stuff in the blackmarket in the form of denatured spirit, varnish, polish, etc., and ruin their health, it contradicts the other argument that everybody is distilling liquor everywhere. If to-day people can get these poisonous stuffs like polish, varnish and methylated spirit only in the blackmarket and if these are bad stuff, I may presume that there is not so much of illicit distillation as the protagonists of anti-Prohibition try to make out in the course of another chapter of their argument. In course of time, I believe, people will learn to give up poisonous concoctions. But, if it is argued that everybody is making illicit liquor, it could not be poisonous. I know how this liquor is made and how it is fermented and how distilled liquor is made and diluted to 50 per cent and sold as whisky, champagne and the like. I know all these. If the people make illicit liquor, they know how to make it as they were doing it also during the Abkari Act days. Illicit liquor will continue to be made even if I abolish Prohibition tomorrow and Government would have to compete with the blackmarket, with the price of illicit liquor as against the price of licit liquor.

“ Mr. C. Rajeswara Rao knows it thoroughly. He lives near by where they do this. He understands the economics of illicit liquor. He knows the competition between illicit liquor and licit liquor in price. We will not get the revenue, which you imagine we will get, even if it is not tainted money. Government will not be able to get the revenue any longer, which they were able to get till now ; illicit liquor will not go down ; it will not disappear ; you will be having A plus B, that is, both illicit and licit liquor. If the argument is ‘enforcement is not good, it should be strengthened’, I agree it should be strengthened, and I shall do my best in this respect. If I fail to do this, I will throw up my hands and say, ‘it is impossible, and this country must go to the devil’, if I may use that phrase.

6-15
p.m.

“ Mr. N. Satyanarayana has made a strong plea for Prohibition. In 1930 we were in prison together. I did not meet him since then. He has made a wonderful contribution to the debate from personal experience. If there is the right man in the right place and if he works industriously and sincerely, success can be produced. I wish there were more Satyanarayanans in our country and we had them working all over the country ; then, we could do ever so much more than we have been able to do now. We could then reduce all expenditure on administrative staff and save ever so much money for welfare work. Every village could be a happy place to live in. Rural life, to which reference was made, can be improved by a reformed system of education and by choosing public servants from a class of people who will regard loyal service to Government as an honorary duty and not as mere day labour for which full payment must be made. If what I have said

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

can be done, rural life will be improved. Towns may come under mercenary payment. If every village officer, every village headman, every village accountant and every village schoolmaster—all of these have to be paid according to the rules of mercenary calculation as per State Government scales of pay or the Central Government scales of pay, it would be impossible to find the necessary money for it and that is why such an educationist and a realist as Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar, the other day suggested that schoolmasters must be allowed to do their work in part in schools and in part also earn otherwise from other occupations. He may be a landlord, he may be a merchant, he may be anybody, he may be a decent gentleman living on his own lands, and he may yet serve as schoolmaster in his village. My own view is that by a slight modification in our system of rural schools, we can spread education far more effectively than we are now doing and we can preserve the village and make it attractive. But, for this, a lot of courage is needed, because it is very difficult to get out of the rut. Anyway hon. Members of the Legislature in the Assembly and in the Council should give me a chance and some time for that work.

"An appeal has been made by Mrs. Clubwala that we should have a Social Service Minister. If I proceed to appoint a Social Service Minister, it must be a woman (laughter) so far as I know. I would then really lose one from the small army of social workers and make a bureaucrat of her. (Laughter.) The whole of the Government is a social service Ministry. The difference between Government and social workers is that the latter work in smaller areas and sections but intensively and in the spirit and atmosphere of private benevolence. Government's work is, on the other hand, on a mass scale and without the fragrance of personal charity and human sentiment. These are necessary characteristics, good and bad. This Government will do everything to encourage social workers and give them assistance. I should be looked upon as the Social Service Minister in the Cabinet even if Mr. Pattabhirama Rao is to be ignored.

"Social service workers must not depend too much on Government. Social service workers should try to make up for the gap that is increasingly widening in private philanthropy. In the work that is done by Government, there is not the life-giving element of individual emotion, which private charity fosters. I feel that the special function of social service workers is to keep the spirit of private charity alive. Government grants reduce this valuable characteristic of social service.

"There is a demand for the urbanizing of the villages, that is to say, of giving amenities to all villages. Even a little additional amenity to a moderate percentage of our villages will mean a great amount of money and of taxation. I am sorry I know my arithmetic and I have to exhibit it. Amenities can only come from expenditure and expenditure means taxation. We object to every kind of taxation, because the poor are to be taxed—a very correct objection; but I will explain this when I come to taxation.

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“ Then, Sir, reference was made to the Revenue Reserve which were built up and which have been drawn upon until they have disappeared. After the resignation of the Congress Ministry in 1939, there was a demand that the sales tax should be abolished because the drink revenue was not given up. During that period, the Government-in-charge did not spend all the receipts from the sales tax but built up this reserve. Naturally, the drink revenue having been given up now, these reserves have had to be drawn upon.

“ The only true tax on the rich is the income-tax. When Gladstone introduced this during a national crisis, everybody was against it. But it has come to take the first place now in all civilized Governments. The objections then raised to the income-tax bear a family resemblance to the objections raised to the sales tax in this State. But the small income-tax introduced by Mr. Gladstone has grown into a 19 sh. in the £ tax now and everyone taxes it for granted.

“ In India, the Centre has taken this tax to itself along with all other rich resources, Customs and Excise revenues, and left only the miserable section of the population to be taxed by the States. If you look into the figures, you will find that the actual figures are about 150 odd crores from income-tax and corporation tax and much more than that by way of customs. The excise revenue comes to 80 crores. They have left only the miserable section of the people to the States. (Laughter.) It is a fact which the schedules in the Indian Constitution will bear out. The milch cow is the Centre's, and all the famished livestock is ours with horns to gore any one going near (laughter), but with neither milk nor flesh in their bodies. The peasant may be taxed by us, the miserable people who wish to hide their sorrows in toddy and arrack may be taxed by us, the litigant may be made to pay us. They left the unpromising tax on sales to us. This was a fortunate lapse on their part. We have done well on this last (sales tax) braving all opposition. But after we have won the battles, and made something out of it, the greedy eyes of the Centre are on it now. (Laughter.) But I won't proceed further.

“ The injustice of taking all the income-tax was felt pretty soon by the Centre. They agreed to share the income-tax with States and make grants out of it. That is, they said half of this income-tax collections will be divided among the twenty odd States. This has been the subject of awards from time to time by altering the ratio. Out of the one half of the total collections so set apart for grants to the States, to-day Madras gets 17.5 per cent of the available pool, that is, 17.5 per cent of half of the net revenue under income-tax. On the basis of population, Madras should get 20.5 per cent of the pool and not only 17.5 per cent. But there is an argument on behalf of some States that milk is got from the udder and not the cow. They say that as income-tax is collected mostly in Bombay and Calcutta, the question of population should not count. But Madras has been pressing that it must be decided

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[11th July 1952]

on the basis of population, because the needs of the people are counted more or less on the basis of population and so the requirements of the people must be met from the pool. If we succeed we will get 20.5 per cent and not 17.5 per cent only. I won't go further because the Finance Commission is sitting to make recommendations to the President of India. I was busy with them yesterday and to-day. It is possible under the Constitution that the Excise revenue of India, which is between 80 and 90 crores annually (and half of it would be between 40 and 45 crores) may also be added to the income-tax pool, if the Finance Commission recommend it. An amount of 40 crores will be a substantial addition to the income-tax pool. It is a matter for negotiation and sweet reasonableness. Declamatory speeches will not help.

"The per capita income in Madras State is Rs. 254. The State taxation including all forms of revenue is Rs. 8.71 per head. Rs. 9 on Rs. 250 is pretty heavy remembering that so much out of the per capita annual income must be spent out of the family budget. The Central revenues are also got from out of this Rs. 250 by way of taxes, duties and the like, and also local duties, cesses of municipal and local boards. All these must be met from this. So the representatives of the people naturally object to additional taxation at every Budget session. They want the Government of Madras to tax the rich; but the rich have been appropriated by the Centre, as I have already explained. Anything we try to do to them is frustrated between the two of them. (Laughter.) The Central Government does not want its milk to be filched by us. The rich tax-payers too will not let us milk them. They have power and resources to join up with the Centre and in the name of co-ordination, commerce and uniformity frustrate our efforts to get anything that could possibly be got. I do hope that people who work in the Centre, in whatever capacity it be, would create public opinion in favour of State finances. Otherwise, hemmed in between the Centre and the objections and tactics of the rich on the one side and the genuine objections of the poor on the other side, how is the Government of Madras or any other State Government to satisfy the demands for order, for welfare and for improvement? That difficulty is reflected in the Budget, in the proposals as well as the objections to the proposals. It is no wonder then that during Budget time the Opposition and the Government Benches, all raise the same cries of 'No, No.' Yet wisdom and patience must steer the Government's ship and I hope the crew will be loyal. The canvas is necessary and important for the artist's picture. Don't tear off the canvas. Then there can be no picture good or bad. That is my request.

6-30
p.m.

"We have but few resources to depend on and even there we have transferred away, let me remind hon. Members, the entertainment taxes, the profession taxes, the property taxes and the surcharge on stamps to local bodies because they too must live and must carry on. Even the terminal railway taxes, let me tell hon. Members, are the Centre's. They do not belong to us.

11th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

"Now, my Finance Minister is young comparatively, and being young, he got ill after his labours. I think young men are entitled to get sick; it is only the old people who cannot afford to get sick. I am glad everyone is encouraging him to grow to his full stature and helping him, giving him all friendliness and assistance. He has undertaken great responsibilities. His task is difficult. It was most generous of him to offer to bear the brunt of my task in the worst part of my duties and he is doing it well. I am grateful to everyone that is friendly and helpful to him.

"I am glad to note he is courageous without bluster. He is prepared to ignore popular favour when the interests of the State require him to do a certain thing. It is false democracy to be blown about by the winds of popular favour. Our sails must be set firmly in the direction of our goal. Thank you, Sir, for giving me this much time."

MR. CHAIRMAN:—"The House will now adjourn to meet again at 4 o'clock on Wednesday, the 30th July 1952."

The House then adjourned.

III.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

Notifications making amendments to Madras Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, published with Home Department Notification No. 357, dated 29th March 1940, as subsequently amended—

(1) Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 2014, Home, dated 5th June 1952.

(2) Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 1874, Home, dated 20th May 1952.